



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

12

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,122	08/20/2001	Greg D. Schechter	50037.30USU1	7727
27488	7590	08/09/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			WU, QING YUAN	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			PAPER NUMBER	
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/934,122	Applicant(s) SCHECHTER ET AL.	
	Examiner Qing-Yuan Wu	Art Unit 2194	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**WILLIAM THOMSON**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-6, 8-19 and 21 are pending in the application.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following claim language is indefinite:

- i. As per claim 21, it is uncertain whether "the adapter set" on lines 9-10 refers to "an adapter set" on line 9 or "an adapter set" on line 5 (i.e. if they are the same then

“said” or “the” should be used and “the adapter set” should be use for all instances of “an adapter set”).

ii. As per claim 5, it is uncertain whether “the selected adapter” on line 6 refers to “selecting each adapter in the adapter set” on claim 4, line 3 or “selecting each adapter in the ancestor adapter set” on line 5.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hafsteinsson et al (hereafter Hafsteinsson) (U.S. PG Pub 2004072484A1).

7. Hafsteinsson was cited in the last office action.

8. As to claim 1, Hafsteinsson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including computer-implemented method for selecting an adapter to transform information sent from a

server object to a device and information sent from the device to the server object [pg. 4, paragraph 59, lines 1-3], comprising:

determining a capability of the device [pg. 2, paragraph 23, lines 10-13];

selecting conversion and selection rules based on the capability of the device [pg. 2, paragraph 17, lines 1-13, and paragraph 20, lines 7-14; pg. 4, paragraph 60];

9. Hafsteinsson does not specifically teach retrieving information about an adapter set based on the capability, using the information to determine if the adapter set is application to the capability, if the adapter set is applicable, selecting the adapter set, wherein the adapter is selected from the adapter set. However, Hafsteinsson disclosed the search/selection of selection/conversion rules based on the capabilities of a particular device from databases of conversion rules and based on these conversion rules transforming information to device-specific information suitable for display in a mobile device requesting the information [pg. 1, paragraph 6, lines 10-15; pg. 2, paragraphs 14-17].

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the selection/conversion rules from the databases have to be determined of its applicability to the capability of the requesting device before they are selected to transformed information tailored to meet the capabilities of the particular device requesting the information [pg. 1, paragraph 7].

11. As to claim 2, Hafsteinsson does not specifically teach determining the capability of the device includes querying the device. However, Hafsteinsson disclosed determining the capability of the device upon parameters passed in as a part of a request [pg. 2, paragraph 17]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take an active approach in determining the capability of the device in the case that the server cannot determine the device's capability or identify the device based on its request.

12. As to claim 3, Hafsteinsson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein determining the capability of the device includes looking up the capability in a database [pg. 2, paragraph 23].

13. As to claim 4, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

14. As to claim 6, Hafsteinsson as modified does not specifically teach retrieving information is performed by double dispatching. However, it is well known in the art to use multi-dispatching/double dispatching when parallel hierarchies exist.

15. As to claim 8, this is a computer program product claim that corresponds to method claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as method claim 1 above.

16. As to claim 9, Hafsteinsson as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the device transmits its capability [pg. 2, paragraph 17].

17. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as method claim 3 above.

18. As to claims 11-12, these claims are rejected for the same reason as method claim 4 above.

19. As to claim 13, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

20. As to claim 14, Hafsteinsson teaches substantially the method for selecting an adapter to transform information. Therefore Hafsteinsson teaches substantially the system for implementing the method.

21. As to claims 15-16, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 2-3 above.

22. As to claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

23. As to claim 18, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above.

24. As to claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

25. As to claim 21, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 4 above.

26. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hafsteinsson as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Glass (U.S. Patent 6,629,128).

27. As to claim 5, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above. In addition, Hafsteinsson as modified does not specifically teach ancestor adapter. However, Glass teaches remote proxies that inherit the attributes from its ancestors/superclasses [Glass, col. 8, lines 8-56]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching of Glass with the teaching of Hafsteinsson to further enhance the teaching of Hafsteinsson by including the advantage of inheritance for reducing programming redundancy.

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 6,023,714 and U.S. PG Pub 2002/0073163 teach adapting document layout to different devices. "Schema for Object-Oriented XML" to Davidson et al. teach object-oriented XML.



*Response to Arguments*

29. Applicant's arguments filed 5/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

30. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that:

- a. There is nothing in the provisional indicating that a capability of a device is ever determined.
- b. Hafsteinsson does not teach adapter ancestors.
- c. Hafsteinsson does not teach adapter or adapter's ancestor maps to a control.

31. Examiner respectfully traversed Applicant's remarks:

32. As to point (a), applicant is directed to the examiner's advisory action dated 3/27/06. The examiner hereby further explains how the capability of the device is determined in the provisional application 60/194,695. The request from the device to the system identifies what transformation to use to transform the HTML document, and based on the request, the device's capability can be determined [provisional application, pg. 3, lines 11-16; pg. 6, lines 10-12].

33. As to point (b), the argument is mooted in view of the new ground of rejection. *See rejection for claim 5 above.*

34. As to point (c), Hafsteinsson does not specifically teach retrieving information as recited

in claim 1, therefore a control identified by the information was not being taught. However, Hafsteinsson disclosed the search/selection of selection/conversion rules based on the capabilities of a particular device from databases of conversion rules and based on these conversion rules transforming information to device-specific information suitable for display in a mobile device requesting the information [pg. 1, paragraph 6, lines 10-15; pg. 2, paragraphs 14-17]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have recognized that the selection/conversion rules selected are applicable to the capability of the requesting device before they are selected to transformed information tailored to meet the capabilities of the particular device requesting the information [pg. 1, paragraph 7].

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-6:00pm Monday-Thursday and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Art Unit: 2194

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Qing-Yuan Wu

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2194

  
**WILLIAM THOMSON**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100